8:Service E-3 (1946) 1947
N714 Plateau Yumans N714
Havasupai

423 planted stand in the fields and not or are destroyed. These things are so closely
[423 bin that it seems disgraceful that anyone else should consider using them after
768 he is dead. The land, however, is not so closely associated with the man who
uses it. He can plant on it whenever he chooses, but has no right to dispose of it
[425] as he sees fit without consulting his relatives, and additionally, the opinion of the
whole closely integrated community is an important factor influencing any deci-
sion he may wish to make.

177 Tribal government is vested in the three native chiefs who are now permanent
698 members of the council created by the Indian Office, but the chiefs and the
428 council exercise little authority, although they are encouraged to do so. Prob-
621 lems of inheritance and land rights, if not solved by the family, are usually
argued out and settled by general public opinion, or in extreme cases of non-
agreement are carried to the Government Agent as a last resort. For several
years the Indian Office has encouraged the Havasupai to make legal statements
and wills which would settle the disputes so often attending subdivision of
land after a death. These attempts were, of course, based on the assumption
that the Havasupai men owned their land as we own ours. That this assumption
was not accurate,[3] however, is attested by the fact that in most of the few cases
on record, the wills were disputed, and the land was finally subdivided accord-
ing to the usual complex pattern which pays little or no attention to any per-
verse notions of the previous occupant.

423 When Prince Wako was a feeble old man, he wanted to turn his land over
578 to Lemuel Pays and Henry Hamus, who had been caring for him. Henry was a
cousin, and Lemuel was a more distant relative by marriage. Wako's daughter
Lily, and his niece Katie, who had not taken any responsibility for his care, were
left out. They started a fuss which became quite bitter. It is said that the old
man was so upset that he locked himself in his house, set fire to it, and burned
to death. Katie and Lily divided the land. The inheritance patterns which justi-
fied this will be discussed below; suffice it at present to note that even in this
dramatic situation, Prince Wako had no voice in the disposition of the land
which he had worked all his life.

121 It should be apparent from the above discussion that familial rights outrank
● 125 individual rights. As mentioned before, however, the fact of dispute and
428

Complex of the Pueblos (in Essays in Anthropology Presented to A. L. Kroeber, pp. 229-232, Berkeley, 1936).

3 This is not said as criticism, and furthermore it does not apply to Mr Noble O. Guthrie, the present sub-agent in charge at Supai. He has made a sincere effort to understand the ways of the Indians, and has achieved considerable success. I am extremely indebted to him for his interest and cooperation.

8:Service E-5 (1946) 1947
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

complexities indicate that factors other than simple familial inheritance rules must also be operative. In order to extract some sense from the obvious intricacies of inheritance, it was necessary to prepare a community genealogy, and to draft a detailed map showing the location and the proprietorship of each little plot of land; then the history of each of these individual pieces of land was detailed back as far as it was practical. From a study of the mass of this sort of data, it is possible to isolate three main considerations which tend to govern the familial and community decisions in land reallocation.

First, and most obvious, is closeness of relationship. It must be noted in this regard that "closeness" is perhaps better understood here to involve personal closeness and propinquity rather than actual blood relationship, though the two usually tend to be coincident. Thus a relative who lives and works in close harmony with his other relatives is considered nearer than one who lives away.[6] A second factor involves the personal qualities of the heirs, for a high premium is placed on industry and cooperation. A third factor, and an important one, is the relative needs of the persons being considered. Either or both of the second and third considerations often outweigh closeness of relationship.

I shall illustrate these three points with examples and supplementary discussion. When Gattagama died, Crook, his only heir, received all the land. This is a simple case of patrilineal inheritance, father to son. This is the only example of such simple inheritance, however, for this father and only son relationship is unusual.

The second factor, that allocation of land depends to some extent on the personal qualifications of the individual, is often very important. The three men who are poorest in land holdings, Joe Jones, Pete Mulgulla, and Spoonhead, can be cited to illustrate this point. Joe Jones is one of three brothers, but he inherited very little compared to the other two, because it is said, "He was lazy and wouldn't work." Pete Mulgulla never was interested in farming and, when he was younger, preferred to leave the canyon periodically to work for white men instead of helping care for the familial lands. Spoonhead is lazy and also has been regarded as not quite right in the head.

The third factor, need, is frequently decisive in determining which of several claimants to a plot of land will get it, or if several plots are involved, who will get the most. This concern over need operates at all times and it is not unusual that for this reason alone a distant relative of a dead man might get more land

6 See Micha Titiev, *The Influence of Common Residence on the Unilateral Classification of Kindred* (American Anthropologist, vol. 45, pp. 511-530, 1943).